

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 12/22/2008 has been fully considered and made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

4. **Regarding claim 1, in step b),** the phrase “loading offsetting dies with the stamped wire elements to constitute a winding, the stamped wire elements to constitute an integrated star point, and the stamped wire elements for supplying current to the winding” (lines 2-4) renders the claims indefinite, because step a) does not recite such wire elements to constitute a winding, to constitute an integrated star point, or for supplying current to the winding.

5. Further, the phrase “and rotating said stamped wire elements counter to one another in a circumferential direction which is transverse to a longitudinal direction of the stamped wire elements so that the stamped wire elements are disposed at right angles to one another and radially inward” (lines 4-8) renders the claim indefinite, because it is unclear which stamped wire elements are being referred to, i.e. the wire elements stamped in step a) or the stamped wire elements recited in lines 2-4 of step b).

6. Also, the phrase "so that the stamped wire elements are disposed at right angles to one another and radially inward" (Ins. 7 and 8) renders the claim indefinite, since it is not clear what is being done. The fact that the stamped wire elements are at right angles to each other would suggest that, given two stamped wire elements, they are disposed such that the longitudinal direction of one is perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the other. However, it is unclear how more than two stamped wire elements can satisfy this relationship, since, at least some of the stamped wire elements would differ from 90 degrees in the angle between them. Also, as currently claimed, the radially inward direction cannot be ascertained, since the claim does not set forth any spatial or structural relationship between the recited radial direction and any of the other structural elements.

7. **Regarding step c),** the phrase "and offsetting the ends of the stamped ... winding head is formed" (3-6) renders the claim indefinite, because, as currently claimed, it is unclear what is meant by "so that the integrated star point is maintained".

8. Also, as above, it is unclear whether "the stamped wire elements" (lines 2 and 4) refers to the wire elements stamped in step a) or the stamped wire elements recited in lines 2-4 of step b).

9. Further, the phrase "wherein manufacture of the integrated star point takes place simultaneously in the same process step as the offsetting of the wire elements" (lines 6 and 8) renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear during which particular offsetting process the integrated star point is formed, i.e. during the offsetting in line 1 of step c) or in that of line 3 of step c).

10. Moreover, the integrated star point was already formed in step b) (lines 8 and 9), and, therefore, it is unclear how it can also be manufactured in step c), during the offsetting (see last four lines of step c)).

11. **Regarding step d)**, it is unclear if "stamped wire elements" (lines 2 and 8) refers to the stamped wire elements of lines 2-4 of step b) or the wire elements stamped in step a). Further, the phrase "wherein the entire connecting ring is disposed radially inward on an inside of a finished winding head, wherein said winding head includes the ends of the stamped wire elements" renders the claim indefinite, since, as currently claimed, the recited radially inward position cannot be ascertained. Moreover, a winding head is formed in step c) (line 6), and it is therefore unclear whether the "a finished winding head" of step d) (line 5) is the same or a different winding head.

12. **Regarding step e)**, the phrase "a winding" (lines 1 and 2) renders the claim indefinite, since, as currently claimed, it is unclear whether the recited winding is in any way related to the winding head recited in steps c) or d) or to the "stamped wire elements to constitute a winding" in lines 1 and 2 of step b). Also, the star point was already connected to the connecting ring by an electrical contacting of the integrated star point (lines 2 and 3 in step d)). It is unclear whether the contacting of line 2 in step e) is different from or the same as the contacting recited in step d).

13. **Regarding claim 4**, it is unclear which particular offsetting dies are being referred to, i.e. those of step b) (line 1) or those of step c) (line 3). Also, it is unclear if the wire elements (line 3) recited in the claim are the same as or different from the stamped wire elements (lines 2 and 3).

14. **Regarding claims 6 and 7**, it would appear the recited "wire cage" (claim 6) and "wire basket" (claim 7) are one and the same. Therefore, the language of claim 7 should be corrected, so as to make it clear the wire basket is the recited wire cage of claim 6.

15. **Regarding claim 8**, the phrase "on contacting end of the winding" is grammatically incorrect.

16. **Regarding claim 10**, the phrase "the wire elements" (lines 3 and 5) renders the claim indefinite, since it would appear this phrase refers to the wire elements of step a) in claim 1. However, in step e) of claim 1, the automatable contacting is performed upon the integrated star point, which is formed of *stamped wire elements*, not of *wire elements*.

17. **Regarding claim 11**, the phrase "bent ends of star point wires" renders the claim indefinite, since claim 1 does not recite a step of bending wires, and the phrase "the star point wires" lacks proper antecedent basis, since claim 1 refers to no such wires.

18. **Regarding claim 13**, see the corresponding issues identified in claim 1, since claim 1 is a combination of steps a-d of claim 1 and previously recited claim 13.

19. In addition, in step d), line 7, the phrase "star point wires" lacks proper antecedent basis, as above in claim 11. Further, it is unclear what is meant by "on inside the of the winding head" in line 8 of step d).

20. **With respect to all of the claims**, it should also be noted that Applicants appear to be relying on the reference numbers in parentheses to identify the particular (stamped) wire elements undergoing a transformation, but this is not proper. The actual claim language must set forth distinguishing characteristics, so as to make it clear which particular type of wire element is being acted on. For example, step b) of claim 1 recites "the stamped wire elements (7) to constitute a winding (32), the stamped wire elements (11) to constitute an integrated star point (21), and the stamped wire elements (12) for supplying current to the winding (32) and rotating said stamped wire elements (7)". However, the actual claim language (i.e. without the reference numbers) reads "the stamped wire elements to constitute a winding, the stamped wire elements to constitute an integrated star point, and the stamped wire elements for supplying current to the winding and rotating said stamped wire elements". As can be seen, it is impossible to understand which stamped wire elements are rotated. Once again, the claim language in itself must establish the difference between the elements, Applicants cannot rely on the reference numbers to differentiate between structural elements.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
22. Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 13, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafer (US5508571) in view of Maesoba (US6339871) and Oohashi (US6707211) as well as over Maesoba in view of Shafer and Oohashi.

23. **Given the substantial number of issues identified above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, the scope of the claims cannot be properly ascertained. The rejection applied on 1/11/2008 and 7/9/2008 is maintained, except as discussed below, since it appears to still be applicable to the claims, as best understood. See the *Response to Arguments* below.**

24. **Regarding step e) of claim 1**, in Shafer, to form the star point, a connecting ring (24, Fig. 1) is placed on an inside of a finished winding head, and attaching the wires for the integrated star point to the ring is performed either by soldering, brazing, welding (i.e. thermal attachment), or other means of mechanical and electrical attachment (see col. 4, Ins. 1-16).

25. **Regarding claims 11 and 13** it is noted that the references disclose wires with bent ends facing one another in a star shape and being connected with the connecting ring. Also regarding claim 13, please refer to the rejection of claim 1 as articulated herein and in the prior Office Actions mentioned above, since the current claim 13 is a combination of steps a-d of claim 1 and the previously presented claim 13.

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments filed 11/10/2008 and 12/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

27. Applicants have overcome some of the issues under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. However, not all issues were resolved, and the amendments filed on 11/10/2008 and 12/22/2008 raised further issues, as identified above. Applicant is

respectfully asked to correct all of the claims such that the claim language is consistent throughout and such that the method steps are consistent with the specification.

28. With respect to the applied prior art, Applicants argue **claim 1** "defines that the wire ends are bent radially inwardly with their ends, and then the radially inwardly formed winding head composed of the wire windings is connected with a connecting ring 40." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. No such language has been found anywhere in claim 1. For example, claim 1 does not recite a step of bending.

29. Applicants also argue the applied references do not disclose "that on an interconnection point end of the winding, an automatic contacting of the start point by corresponding means is provided." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all, the claims do not recite a "start point". Also, as best understood, the claim language would appear to require connecting the wires constituting the star point by means of a process such as resistance welding, laser welding, electron welding, soldering, hot pressing, or cold pressing, which process can be automated. As discussed in the rejection, Shafer discloses attaching the wires for the integrated star point to the ring either by soldering, brazing, welding (i.e. thermal attachment), or other means of mechanical and electrical attachment (see col. 4, Ins. 1-16). These processes can clearly be automated, i.e. are automatable. It is unclear why Applicants argue the references do not disclose the claimed limitation.

30. **With respect to claim 13**, Applicants argue the references do not disclose "three start point wires facing one another with bent ends lying on the inside of the winding head and connected with the connecting ring." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As

best understood, the claim requires three wires connected to the connecting ring and having bent ends which "lie on inside the of the winding head". As can be seen in Fig. 1, various wires N are to be connected with connecting ring 24. It is readily apparent that upon connecting the wires to the ring, the wires will have ends that are bent to some extent and lie on and inside the winding head 16.

Conclusion

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIVIUS R. CAZAN whose telephone number is (571) 272-8032. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID P. BRYANT can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. Dexter Tugbang/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3729

L. R. C./ 2/15/2009
Examiner, Art Unit 3729